

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, March 31, 1997
Volume 33—Number 13
Pages 399–427

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

- Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry—415
- Medicare fraud initiative—409
- National Cancer Institute's recommendations on mammography—417
- NCAA football champion University of Florida Gators—420
- Radio address—408

Communications to Congress

- Cuba, letter reporting—425
- Zaire, letter reporting—421

Communications to Federal Agencies

- Protections for human subjects of classified research, memorandum—422

Executive Orders

- Amendment to Executive Order 13017, Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry—412

Interviews With the News Media

- Exchange with reporters
- Oval Office—413, 417
- Roosevelt Room—409

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

- News conference with President Yeltsin of Russia in Helsinki, Finland, March 21 (No. 139)—399

Letters and Messages

- Easter, message—425

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

- Bosnia-Herzegovina, President Izetbegovic—413
- Russia, President Yeltsin—399

Proclamations

- Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy—412

Statements by the President

- Campaign finance reform legislation—411
- Protections for human subjects of classified research—424

Supplementary Materials

- Acts approved by the President—427
- Checklist of White House press releases—426
- Digest of other White House announcements—426
- Nominations submitted to the Senate—426

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, March 28, 1997

**The President's News Conference
With President Boris Yeltsin of
Russia in Helsinki, Finland**
March 21, 1997

President Clinton. Please sit down everyone. Don't make me all alone. *[Laughter]* Let me say that President Yeltsin and I will have opening statements, and then we'll begin alternating questions, first with a question from the Russian press and then the American press and then back and forth.

I would like to begin by thanking President Ahtisaari, Prime Minister Lipponen, all the people of Finland for their very gracious hospitality to President Yeltsin and to me and for the extremely constructive role that Finland plays in a new era for Europe.

This is my first meeting with President Yeltsin in each of our second terms, our 11th meeting overall. At each meeting we have strengthened our nations' relationship and laid a firmer foundation for peace and security, freedom and prosperity in the 21st century.

Here in Helsinki we have addressed three fundamental challenges: first, building an undivided, democratic, and peaceful Europe for the first time in history; second, continuing to lead the world away from the nuclear threat; and third, forging new ties of trade and investment that will help Russia to complete its remarkable transformation to a market economy and will bring greater prosperity to both our peoples.

A Europe undivided and democratic must be a secure Europe. NATO is the bedrock of Europe's security and the tie that binds the United States to that security. That is why the United States has led the way in adapting NATO to new missions, in opening its doors to new members, in strengthening its ties to nonmembers through the Partnership For Peace, in seeking to forge a strong, practical partnership between NATO and Russia. We are building a new NATO just as the Russian

people are building a new Russia. I am determined that Russia will become a respected partner with NATO in making the future for all of Europe peaceful and secure.

I reaffirmed that NATO enlargement in the Madrid summit will proceed, and President Yeltsin made it clear that he thinks it's a mistake. But we also have an important and, I believe, overriding agreement. We agreed that the relationship between the United States and Russia and the benefits of cooperation between NATO and Russia are too important to be jeopardized.

We didn't come here expecting to change each other's mind about our disagreement, but we both did come here hoping to find a way of shifting the accent from our disagreement to the goals, the tasks, and the opportunities we share. And we have succeeded.

President Yeltsin and I agree that NATO Secretary General Solana and Russian Foreign Minister Primakov should try to complete negotiations on a NATO-Russian document in the coming weeks. It would include a forum for regular consultations that would allow NATO and Russia to work and to act together as we are doing today in Bosnia. It would demonstrate that a new Russia and a new NATO are partners, not adversaries, in bringing a brighter future to Europe.

We also agreed that our negotiators and those of the other 28 participating states should accelerate their efforts in Vienna to adapt the CFE treaty to the post-cold-war era by setting new limits on conventional forces.

The second area of our discussion involved our obligation to continue to lead the world away from the dangers of weapons of mass destruction. We have already taken important steps. We signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We extended a non-proliferation treaty. We stopped targeting each other's cities and citizens. We put START I into force. And we're both com-

mitted to securing ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention before it goes into force next month, so that we can finally begin to banish poison gas from the Earth.

Today President Yeltsin agreed to seek the Duma's prompt ratification of START II, already ratified by the United States Senate. But we will not stop there. The United States is prepared to open negotiations on further strategic arms cuts with Russia under a START III immediately after the Duma ratifies START II. President Yeltsin and I agreed on guidelines for START III negotiations that will cap at 2,000 to 2,500 the number of strategic nuclear warheads each of our countries would retain, and to finish the reductions of START III by the year 2007. Now, think about it. This means that within a decade we will have reduced both sides' strategic nuclear arsenals by 80 percent below their cold war peak of just 5 years ago.

We also reached agreement in our work to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, a cornerstone of our arms control efforts. Distinguishing between ballistic missile systems restricted by the ABM Treaty and theater missile defenses that are not restricted has been a very difficult issue to resolve. Today, after 3 years of negotiations, we agreed to preserve the ABM Treaty while giving each of us the ability to develop defenses against theater missiles.

Finally, we discussed our economic relationship in the fact that the strong and secure Russia we welcome as a full partner for the 21st century requires that the benefits of democracy and free markets must be felt by Russia's citizens.

President Yeltsin recently demonstrated his determination to reinvigorate economic reform in his State of the Federation Address and with the appointment of a vigorous new economic team. His bold agenda to improve the investment climate and stimulate growth includes comprehensive tax reform, new energy laws, and tough anticrime legislation.

To help American companies take advantage of new opportunities in Russia, we will mobilize support to help finance billions of dollars in new investment. We will work with Russia to advance its membership in key international economic institutions like the WTO, the Paris Club, and the OECD. And

I am pleased to announce, with the approval of the other G-7 nations, that we will substantially increase Russia's role in our annual meeting, now to be called the Summit of the Eight, in Denver this June.

Here in Helsinki, we have proved once again that we can work together to resolve our differences, to seize our opportunities, to build a better future.

Before I turn the microphone over to President Yeltsin, let me say one word about the bombing today in Tel Aviv, which we have both been discussing in the last few minutes. Once again, an act of terror has brought death and injury to the people of Israel. I condemn it, and I extend my deepest sympathies to the families of those who were killed or injured. There is no place for such acts of terror and violence in the peace process.

There must be absolutely no doubt in the minds of the friends or of the enemies of peace that the Palestinian Authority is unalterably opposed to terror and unalterably committed to preempting and preventing such acts. This is essential to negotiating a meaningful and lasting peace, and I will do what I can to achieve that objective.

Mr. President.

President Yeltsin. Esteemed journalists, ladies and gentlemen, the first meeting of the Presidents of Russia and the United States has been held after our reelection. Naturally, it was a difficult one because difficult issues were under discussion. But as always, our meeting was quite frank, and on the whole, it was successful. And I am completely in accord with what the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, just said.

We have opened a new stage of Russian-American relations. We discussed in detail the entire range of Russian-American issues—issues of Russian-American partnership which is quite broad in scale. After all, our countries occupy such a position in the world that the global issues are a subject of our discussions.

Both sides defended their national interests, and both countries did not abandon them. However, our two great powers have an area—a vast area—of congruent interests. Chief among these is the stability in the international situation. This requires us to develop

our relations, and there has been progress in that direction.

Five joint statements have been signed as a result of our meeting. President Bill Clinton and I just concluded signing these—on European security, on parameters of future reductions in nuclear forces, concerning the ABM missile treaty, on chemical weapons, and we also signed a U.S.-Russian economic initiative.

But we have not merely stated our positions. We view the signed statements with the U.S. President as a program of our joint action aimed to develop Russian-American partnership. I would say that emotions sometimes get the upper hand in assessing Russian-American partnership. This is not the approach that Bill and I have. Let's not forget that establishing the Russian-American partnership relations is a very complex process. We want to overcome that which divided us for decades. We want to do away with the past mistrust and animosity. We cannot accomplish this immediately. We need to be decisive and patient, and we have both with Bill Clinton.

I firmly believe that we will be able to resolve all issues which, for the time being, are still outstanding. Today's meeting with Bill convinced me of this once again. We will be doing this consistently, step by step. We will have enough patience and decisiveness.

And now I ask you to put questions to us.

Russia and NATO

Q. Boris Nikolayevich, our first impression is that there was no breakthrough on NATO here in Helsinki. Tell me, can there be some kind of movement forward before the Madrid summit?

President Yeltsin. I don't agree with you. It was today that we had progress, very principled progress, and they consist of the following—that, yes, indeed, we do maintain our positions. We believe that the eastward expansion of NATO is a mistake and a serious one at that. Nevertheless, in order to minimize the negative consequences for Russia, we decided to sign an agreement with NATO, a Russia-NATO agreement. And this is the principal question here. We've agreed on the parameters of this document with President Bill Clinton.

This is the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to those new members of NATO to not proliferate conventional weapons in these countries. We agreed on non-use of the military infrastructure which remained in place after the Warsaw Pact in these countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The decision of joint actions with Russia alone, this, too, will be included in the agreement with NATO.

And finally, we've come to an agreement that this document will be binding for all. For that reason, everyone will sign this, all heads of state of all 16 member nations of NATO. This is a very principled issue, and we came to agreement on this with President Bill Clinton. That is, all states, all nations—and this will take place before Madrid—all heads of state will sign this document we sign together with Bill Clinton. And then there will be a signature of the General Secretary of NATO. And we believe that this document indeed is binding for NATO, for Russia, for all states whose leaders signed this document. So this is a very principled progress.

We didn't talk about this just yesterday and the day before. We couldn't have. We can only talk about this now, during these minutes, once we've signed the statements with the President of the United States.

President Clinton. Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press].

Status of New NATO Members

Q. President Yeltsin, after all that you've been told about how the world has changed and that there will be no nuclear weapons in Eastern Europe, do you still regard NATO's enlargement as a danger to Russia?

And to President Clinton, this exclusion of nuclear weapons from Eastern Europe and the promise that there will be no big troop buildup in the new states, does that mean that NATO's new members will be second-class citizens, second-class members?

President Yeltsin. No, of course not, no one will think of these as being secondary states. No one is calling that. That's not what's involved here. However, I believe and Bill believes the same thing, Bill Clinton believes the same, that these decisions that can be taken, they will be taken by all leaders

of these nations, which is extremely, extremely important. I already mentioned this.

President Clinton. Let me say, Terry, in answer to the question you raised to me, emphatically no, this does not mean any new members would be second-class members. That's one of the things that we have committed ourselves to. There are no second-class members.

What are the two most important things that you get if you're a member? One is the security guarantee, the mutual security guarantee. The other is a place in the military command structure. These will be available to any new members taken in.

Now, we also want to make it clear that in addition to the security guarantee and participation in the military command structure, NATO is a different organization today than it was. We have a different mission. What is the most important thing NATO is doing today? Working in Bosnia. NATO has a major partnership with Russia in Bosnia. And a partnership, I might add, with a number of other nonmember nations who are in our Partnership For Peace, where we've done joint military exercises and other things.

Now, on the two questions you mentioned—on the nuclear question, the NATO military commanders reached an independent judgment that, based on the facts that exist in the world today, they have no reason, therefore, no intention and no plan to station any nuclear weapons on member's soil. Look, we just announced an agreement here that will reduce nuclear weapons, if we can implement it, within a decade by 80 percent below their cold war height, number one.

Number two, the NATO members have just tabled a proposal on conventional forces in Europe which would put strict limits and would freeze the conventional forces we could have in Europe now, along with having strict limits in the Visegrad countries themselves, which would be the areas where you'd might expect an old difficulty to arise in new circumstances.

So I think we are doing the right thing, the sensible thing. If it is reassuring to Russia, so much the better. We have a clear, new, and different mission for NATO in the 21st century, but clearly not second-class membership.

Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty

Q. President Clinton, it is known that in your Congress there's some criticism frequently that you are a supporter of the ABM Treaty. Today's meeting, did that convince you to strengthen the ABM Treaty?

President Clinton. Some people have criticized me in my Congress because I do support the ABM Treaty. Yes, that's accurate; they have. I do support the ABM Treaty. I think it's important. I believe in it. And we have, I believe, strengthened the chances that the ABM Treaty will survive by the agreement we have made today and the distinctions we have drawn between the missiles that are covered by the ABM Treaty and by theater defense missiles. I believe that very strongly.

There are those in the Congress of the United States, but they are not a majority—let me emphasize, they are not a majority—who would undermine the ABM Treaty because they don't believe it's in our interest. I believe they're wrong. I believe that the ABM Treaty has served us well and will continue to serve us well, especially in view of the questions that we have clarified today between us.

Laurie [Laurie Santos, United Press International].

Terrorist Attack in Israel

Q. In light of today's attack on Tel Aviv, sir, you just said the Palestinian Authority is unalterably opposed to terror. Are you saying that there was no green light for terrorist attacks like Prime Minister—

President Clinton. No, no. What I said is—let me clarify what I said. What I intended I say, what I believe I said was that the Palestinian Authority has to make it clear to the friends and to the enemies of the peace process that it is unalterably opposed to terror and must take all possible steps to make that clear and to prevent any terror from occurring. This is a formulation that has frequently been used in the Middle East, but everyone knows that no one in the Middle East can guarantee 100 percent protection against terror. But all the people who participate in the peace process should guarantee 100 percent effort against terror.

Q. What about what Prime Minister Netanyahu?

President Clinton. Well, I can't—first of all, I can't comment decisively, one way or the other, on exactly what was or wasn't done because I don't think any of us know. What I think is very important is that no matter how strongly Mr. Arafat and the Palestinian people feel about the Har Homa decision, nothing—nothing—justifies a return to the slaughter of innocent civilians. It cannot be justified. And we have to have a clear and unambiguous position.

And in the past, when Mr. Arafat has taken that position, I believe it strengthened him. I also believe that acts of terror undermine him because he, in the end, is the popularly elected leader trying to lead the Palestinian people to a peaceful resolution of these differences.

So I have made that very clear just in the last couple of days, and we will continue to work to that end.

Russia-U.S. Relations

Q. The question is to the Russian President. Boris Nikolayevich, you said that this meeting started a new phase for these U.S.-Russian relations. What precisely new was introduced into these relations?

President Yeltsin. Well, first of all, we finally were able to determine our positions on issues of European security. We've come to settle our position on NATO, and we have described for ourselves the parameters of the NATO-Russia agreement.

Secondly, there's an unprecedented reduction of nuclear weapons, that is of START III. That's 85 percent of the overall arsenal of warheads is being reduced in connection with that. That is significant. This is a very principled issue, and this encompasses not only our two countries but of the entire European continent and the whole world.

And the question on economics reflects a completely different approach. We won't conceal this. And I think that Bill Clinton will excuse me if I perhaps am incorrect here, but I think that a certain restriction on questions, holding back on the American side on the Russian economic relations—there was, along the lines of the Ministry of Energy, on antidumping laws and also the Jackson-

Vanik amendment, and many other items speak of the fact that the United States has not been that interested in developing a strong economic Russia or that trade would grow in a healthy way between Russia and the United States.

Finally a breakthrough has been made. A joint statement has been signed. We've discussed these issues in great deal with President Bill Clinton. And on chemical weapons, that, too. Any issue we handled, we've been able to manage a major breakthrough. We didn't discuss small issues. We talked only about strategic issues, and on all five issues we were able to find an answer, we were able to find our common point of view. And that's what is reflected in our joint statements.

President Clinton. If I might just support that question, because I think that's a question all the Americans and all the Russians and others will be interested in. What came out of this meeting that was different? One, the idea that there will be a NATO-Russia agreement that all the leaders will support. That's a significant thing. We agreed to disagree about the question of expansion, but we agreed that there must be a partnership between NATO and Russia going forward into the future.

Two, the notion that Russia should play a larger role in international economic institutions and that if certain internal changes are made, which President Yeltsin has already announced his support for, then the United States will make a more vigorous effort to facilitate investment in Russia.

And third—and I think almost unexpected even among us, we were working along here hoping this would happen—we resolved a number of roadblocks relating to START II and other related issues which permitted us to say that President Yeltsin would seek prompt ratification of START II, and we would together support guidelines for START III, which we would hope could be negotiated quickly after that, which would reduce the cold war arsenals by over 80 percent from the cold war height, to more or less 80 percent. These are dramatic and very substantial results, and I'm very pleased with them.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, Cable News Network].

President Yeltsin. Just a moment, I'd like to continue for a second longer. You've touched on a very current issue which has to be clarified all the way.

Well, you understand, of course, why it is that the State Duma has not yet ratified START II—because ABM was suspended. There was no belief that the treaty from '92 on ABM is not only being complied with by the Russian administration but in the future, conditions are being created which would not allow circumvention of the treaty. In other words, we, for the State Duma, were able to prepare grounds so that the Duma could positively look at the issue of ratifying START II.

President Clinton. Wolf.

Russia-NATO Agreement

Q. Mr. President, Mr. President, one of the most contentious aspects of a potential agreement or charter between NATO and Russia was whether or not it would have to be legally binding on the 16 members of NATO or would simply be a political statement of intent. This agreement that you hope to forge with NATO, do you expect that the legislatures, the U.S. Senate, for example, would have to ratify this agreement, or it would simply be a statement that President Clinton would support?

President Yeltsin. As far as Russia is concerned, we intend to send this treaty and send this agreement to the State Duma for ratification. That's what our intention is.

At the same time, we understand that if 16 states will have to coordinate this issue with their parliaments, this will take up many, many months. And therefore, we've come to an agreement that, given these conditions, it will be quite enough, of course, given the goodwill of these states, simply a signature of the leaders of these countries that would be affixed to this agreement. How the U.S. would act in this regard, let President Bill Clinton respond.

President Clinton. If you look at the language, President Yeltsin has basically said it accurately. We think it's important to get this agreement up, get it signed, and get it observed—have it observed. And there are so many of the NATO countries. What we have called for is for each and every member

country to make—and I believe the exact language of our agreement is, an enduring commitment at the highest political level. And President Yeltsin described to you how we will manifest that.

If our Secretary General, Mr. Solana, and Foreign Minister Primakov succeed in negotiating this agreement within the timeframe that we all anticipate they will be able to, then we would expect to all meet somewhere and publicly affix our signatures and reaffirm our commitment to the terms of the agreement.

Changes in NATO

Q. The question is to the U.S. President. Mr. President, you, both today and on earlier occasions, said that you intend to transform in some way the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. After today's meeting with President Yeltsin, what specifically do the United States plan to do to change the current structure of NATO? Thank you.

President Clinton. Well, first let me point out we have already transformed NATO. When I became President there was no Partnership For Peace, for example. There were no joint exercises where you had Russian troops, American troops, Polish troops, French troops, others. We didn't have these sorts of things. We didn't have a Partnership For Peace with more than two dozen other countries regularly participating with us now in military planning and training and sharing and working together. And we certainly had nothing like our cooperation in Bosnia.

I believe that the old NATO was basically a mirror image of the Warsaw Pact, and that's why I've been very sensitive to why the Russian people or the Russian leaders would wonder about what the new NATO is. There is no Warsaw Pact. There is no cold war. We just made an agreement to work to cut our nuclear arsenals by 80 percent from their cold war height, which I would remind you existed just 5 years ago.

And what we need to recognize is there will be new security threats to Europe. And you can see them. You have dealt—we've seen them in Bosnia. We've seen them in the other ethnic, religious, and racial traumas that you have dealt with along your borders.

You see it in the continuing disputes between nations within the European community.

What we want to do is to provide a way for more and more countries, either as members or as members of the Partnership For Peace—Finland is a good example of an active member of the Partnership For Peace—or because of the special relationship of Russia and the special role Russia will play in the future of Europe and security in the context of the Russia-NATO agreement, we want to provide an opportunity within which all of us can deal with the security aspects of trying to create a Europe that is undivided and democratic for the first time in history.

I would remind you, go back and read from the dawn of nation-states on the continent of Europe, there has never been a time when all the people were living under democratic governments and were free of foreign domination. That has never happened. So we are simply trying to create the conditions in which we can grow together.

Will there be questions? Will there be skepticism along the way? Will there be uncertainty? Of course, there will be. But we are not attempting to draw a different dividing line in Europe, just somewhat further to the East. What we are trying to do is to develop structures that can grow and evolve over time so that there will be a united effort by free people to join their resources together to reinforce each other's security, each other's independence, and their common interdependence. And I believe we will succeed at that.

Let's see, someone else in the back row here. Alison [Alison Mitchell, New York Times].

Ratification of Agreements

Q. To both Presidents, both of you have had problems with your individual parliaments, and yet—

President Clinton. Seems to be a curse of democracy.

Q. Yes. You each have made arms control agreements here that, you know, the parliaments will want a say in. To Mr. Yeltsin, can you guarantee that the Duma will follow your lead and ratify this? And to Mr. Clinton, how can you assure Mr. Yeltsin that you

won't have a rebellion in the Congress over the antimissile defense agreement?

President Yeltsin. As far as Russia is concerned, I expect that the State Duma will make a decision based on my advice. [Laughter]

President Clinton. Boy, I wish I could give that answer. [Laughter] Let me answer—you give me an opportunity, actually, to point out the full elements of this timetable on START III. And for those of you—if you haven't had time to study it, I want to make full disclosure here.

Number one, I expect that our Congress, those who believe in the ABM system but who want us to be able to develop theater missile defenses, which may someday protect all of our friends in different circumstances, including our friends in Russia—who knows what use we will put to theater missile defenses when we have troops that have to be protected in the future—I would think that the Members of Congress who believe in the ABM Treaty but want us to be able to develop theater missile defenses, will be quite pleased by this agreement. I think that that is not where the problem could come.

Let me explain what we agreed to today—and I did it, I might say, with the full concurrence of General Shalikashvili and Secretary of Defense Cohen, who is not here today, but we checked with him. In order to implement START II in a way that is economically feasible for Russia but does not in any way compromise the security of the American people, what we agreed to do in this framework is to set a date of 2007 for the full implementation of the reductions in START III but to delay the date of all the destructions in START II to 2007. We also agreed to move from the beginning of 2003 to the end of 2003 the time that Russia would have to deactivate the warheads covered by START II.

Now, since our Congress ratified START II based on different target dates for the deactivation of the warheads, on the one hand, and the destruction—ultimate destruction of the missiles, on the other, we will have to go back to them, either separately or in the context of a START III agreement, and ask them to ratify that. And they will have a full opportunity to debate and discuss this.

But I have to tell you, when the Russians advanced this possibility—when President Yeltsin advanced this possibility with me today, the thought that the American people might be able to live in a world, within a decade, where the nuclear arsenals had been reduced by 80 percent, and the thought that, in addition to that, accelerating the time we had anticipated it would take us to meet the START III targets would save our Department of Defense precious dollars that we need to secure our defense in other ways and will therefore enhance our national defense as well as reducing the threat, caused General Shalikashvili to recommend this to me, caused Secretary Cohen to sign off on it, and made me think it was a very good arrangement, indeed, for the Russian people and for the American people and, indeed, for anybody else who would be affected by what we do on this issue.

So, yes, I've got to go back to the Congress. I believe they will, once they have a chance to fully review this, support the decision I have made today. It may take us a little longer than President Yeltsin indicated it would take him with the Duma, but I think we will both get a favorable result because this is so clearly in the interests of the Russian and the American people.

Would you like to take one more?

Russia-U.S. Negotiations

Q. Boris Nikolayevich, what's your thought on the version that the Russian giving way on the issue of NATO's expansion to the East will be paid by financial generosity of the West?

President Yeltsin. First of all, I don't see it that way at all. I don't see this generosity at all. If in the statement on economic issues which we had just signed, if there are formulas in there that investments will be supported, investments going to Russia, and certain sums of money will be appropriated by the American side, that does not mean that this is assistance to Russia. This is assistance to the private sector for making investments in Russia. This is assistance to American citizens, not to Russia. Why do you see an exchange here? There's no exchange. And I categorically disagree with that formulation that in place of one we sort of bartered here

and as a result of that we have come up with these ideas. I don't agree with that.

I should say that even the order of looking at these issues—and we've held four tours lasting from 45 minutes to an hour and a half each—the order of looking at these issues was as follows: First, we looked at Europe security and NATO. Secondly, the ABM issue. Then we took up chemical weapons. Then we talked about START III, that is, the reduction of further strategic weapons. And only after that, we started talking of economic issues. I did not know that the American side was preparing this. But you see, first we resolved and discussed all of these issues, and only then we approached the economic question. This should tell you that this was not a case where we used this as a poker chip.

President Clinton. I'd just like to support that. And let me say, first of all, what President Yeltsin said about the order in which we took these issues up is absolutely right, first. Second, I believe that the economic announcements which were made today are in the interest of the American people, both directly and indirectly. Let me deal with the indirect question first.

Russia, in the end, cannot be the strong partner that we seek in the 21st century and cannot be free to help create a very different future for Europe and for itself—a future in which we define our greatness by the way we treat other people and by our success in our free dealings, rather than our ability to dominate them—Russia cannot build that kind of future unless ordinary Russian citizens receive the benefit of free markets and democracy. That will not happen.

Secondly, I believe that Russia has the potential to have enormous economic growth in a short period of time by attracting large flows of investment from around the world, if the elements that President Yeltsin outlined in economic reform and the legal changes which he has proposed to the Duma can be embraced. I would be irresponsible as President of the United States if I did not bring into play the Export-Import Bank and our other mechanisms for investing our money to make American investors competitive with investors from around the world for

new economic opportunities in Russia. It would be irresponsible of me.

If we do that and we put a lot of money in Russia, billions of dollars, will your people have more jobs and higher incomes? Yes, but so will Americans. And all the time I have to be looking at—it would be just like I can't walk away from Latin America. I would be irresponsible if we didn't try to invest in our neighbors in Latin America in the future. So that's the way I feel.

A lot of the areas where you're going to grow in Russia—in the energy sector, just for example, just to take one area—are areas where American businesses have enormous expertise and literally decades of experience. We would be foolish if we walked away from the opportunity that you present to make money and have opportunity.

So I entirely agree with what the President said, but I want to reinforce it from our perspective.

The lady in the back there in the red dress, go ahead.

Finland's Nonaligned Status

Q. I would like to ask something from both of you. How would you react, sir, if Finland would express its willingness to join NATO?

President Clinton. Maybe I should—you asked both. Since I discussed this with the President—he brought it up with me. President Ahtisaari said to me that he thought Finland had made the right decision to be a member of the Partnership For Peace and to maintain its independence and its ability to work constructively with Russia and with NATO nations and not be a member of NATO and that he had no intention of asking that Finland be considered for membership. But he thought that the policy of being able to be considered was a good one because it reinforced the feeling of independence and the security that Finland and other nations who decide to maintain relative independence and membership in the Partnership For Peace had. So I can do no more than to support the statement that your own President has made about this.

President Yeltsin. I, too, would like to respond on this issue. I should say that the reason we respect Finland as a state—its nation, its people, and leadership—is the fact that

Finland is implementing a course of a neutral state, of nonaligning itself to any bloc. This is very important. This creates a very stable and calm balance within the country. This facilitates good neighborly relations with Russia.

We, with Finland, have a turnover of trade of 4.7 billion U.S. dollars. This is 40 percent of the entire turnover of trade. Find me another country that could equal this sort of turnover in trade with Russia. There is no other country. And for that reason, I believe—and, of course, this is the matter entirely of the people of Finland and its government, but that which the President of the Finnish Republic, President Ahtisaari, stated very clearly that he is not joining any blocs. This calls for the feeling of respect for him.

President Clinton. Let me say, since we took an equal number of questions from the Russian and the American journalists but we took a Finnish question, let me, in the interest of fairness—Mr. Donovan [John Donovan, ABC News], you have a question. We ought to take one more question from an American so we'll be even here.

Russia-NATO Agreement

Q. Thank you. I'll make it two questions, one very focused and one somewhat broader. [Laughter]

President Clinton. No good deed goes unpunished here.

Q. The focus question is this: In the Russia-NATO agreement, as envisaged, if there is disagreement—Russia disagrees with something NATO wants to do—does Russia have a veto power? The broader question is this. In the Second World War, it was very simple: We were enemies. We were allies, I meant to say. During the cold war, it was very simple: We were enemies. Today, what word describes this relationship where the situation is not so clear and not so simple?

President Yeltsin. I can respond by saying that the way we solve these issues is by consensus. That's how it is today, indeed, among the NATO countries. And that's how it will be once we conclude an agreement between Russia and NATO, already with the participation of Russia.

President Clinton. The short answer to your question is, a voice but not a veto. And

the answer to your second question is that we are partners, and like all partners in any partnership, starting with a society's most basic partnership, a marriage and a family and going to business partnerships, there are sometimes disagreements. But partnerships are bound together by shared values, shared interests, and the understanding that what you have in common is always more important than what divides you.

And so you work for the consensus that President Yeltsin outlined. And that's where we are, and I think that's exactly where we ought to be. And that's why we are not going to have the kind of cataclysmic bloodshed in the 21st century that we saw through three world wars, the cold war, and countless others in the 20th century. If we can stay with that attitude and work on it, we will have a Europe that's not only peaceful but free and undivided.

Thank you very much.

Q. How are you both feeling?

President Yeltsin. Thank you. *[Laughter]*

President Clinton. Great. I can tell you he feels great. He looks great, and he feels great. And I feel fine.

NOTE: The President's 139th news conference began at 6:45 p.m. at the Kalastaja Torppa Hotel. In his remarks, President Clinton referred to President Martti Ahtisaari and Prime Minister Paavo Lipponen of Finland; NATO Secretary General Javier Solana; Foreign Minister Yevgeniy Primakov of Russia; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu of Israel. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

March 22, 1997

Good morning. I'm glad to be back at the microphone this morning after relying on the Vice President to fill in for me last Saturday. My knee is healing just fine, and I'm happy to report that I've just completed a successful summit meeting with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Helsinki, Finland. Together we're building a strong United States-Russia relationship to meet the challenges of the 21st century, building a democratic, undi-

vided Europe at peace; leading the world away from the nuclear threat; forging new ties of trade and investment that will benefit all our people.

Today I want to talk with you about how we can work together to strengthen America's working families and to help them meet their responsibilities both at work and at home. We have made significant progress in this area with the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. That was landmark legislation, and I was very proud that it was the first bill I signed as President. But I'm even more proud of the impact this law has had on the everyday lives of working families.

Since its enactment, millions of Americans have been able to take unpaid leave to care for a newborn child or to be with a family member who's sick. I know that many Americans would have lost their jobs if it weren't for the family leave law.

With new pressures on families in the way they work and live, we have to do even more to give people the chance to be good workers and good parents. That's why I proposed expanding the Family and Medical Leave Act so that workers can take time off to attend teacher conferences or to take a child for a medical checkup. I have challenged the Congress to pass legislation that will do just that this year, and I have high hopes that they will.

This morning I want to talk about another way to strengthen our working families. I have a plan that offers employees this simple choice: If you work overtime, you can be paid time and a half, just as the law now requires, or if you want, you can take that payment in time, an hour and a half off for every hour of overtime you work. Simply put, you can choose money in the bank or time on the clock. Comp time can be used for a vacation, an extended maternity leave, or to spend more time with your children or your parents.

We can give employees in American business more flexibility. That serves everyone's interests. But we must make sure that as we give greater flexibility, we do it in a way that's good for both business and employees.

Unfortunately, a version of comp time legislation that is moving through Congress now would take the wrong approach. It could ac-

tually leave working families worse off than today. Strong comp-time legislation gives employees the choice of when to take their overtime pay in money or in time off from work. But under the congressional majority's proposal, employees aren't really guaranteed that choice. There are no effective safeguards to stop an employer from telling an employee who needs a paycheck more than family time that he or she has no choice: "You work overtime this week, then I'll give you less time next week."

Strong comp-time legislation would give employees the choice of when they take time off. That's the best way to strengthen families and to give parents more flexibility. But the congressional majority's plan would make it simply too easy for employers to tell workers they cannot take the comp time they have earned.

Under strong comp-time legislation, the time off you have earned is just that, time off. But under the congressional majority's plan, employees who take comp time could be forced to work extra hours at night or on the weekend to make up the time without any overtime pay. That means if you take off a Friday that you have earned by working overtime, your employer could simply make you work Saturday without paying overtime because you haven't worked your full 40-hour week.

Above all, strong comp-time legislation preserves the protection of our 40-hour week, which has been the law now for most of this century. Today the law says if you are an hourly worker and you work longer than 40 hours, you get paid time and a half for overtime. Our plan would give you the choice of taking an hour and a half off for every hour you work instead. But under the congressional majority's plan, some employees who work an extra hour would get only an hour off, less overtime than they would be eligible for today. That's money out of their pocket.

The vast majority of our employers will be fair to their workers under any system. But as we modernize our laws to fit a changing workplace, we have to uphold historic safeguards for all our employees. Giving workers the real choice of taking time off as overtime pay is good for our families. It will help all

Americans balance the demands of home and work. But it's employees and their families, not employers, who should choose if, when, and how they take and use comp time.

Congress should pass expanded family leave and a strong comp-time bill. The moment a responsible comp-time bill hits my desk, I will gladly sign it. It will be good for workers, good for business, good for the economy, and strong in the building of our families. But let me also be clear: I will have to veto any legislation that fails to guarantee real choice for employees, real protection against employer abuse, and real preservation of fair labor standards including the 40-hour week.

It's time for us to join together to give America's families the help they need to succeed on the job and in the home. Let's pass comp-time legislation, but let's do it right.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 2:10 p.m. on March 21 at the Mantyniemi Residence in Helsinki, Finland, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 22.

Remarks on the Medicare Fraud Initiative and an Exchange With Reporters

March 25, 1997

The President. Thank you very much, Governor Chiles. And thank you, Secretary Shalala. Ladies and gentlemen, I also want to thank the representatives of the AARP who are here and others who have been very interested in this program.

As all of you know, and as I have given further evidence of here today, I was recently reminded the hard way that our doctors and medical care are the best in the world. That is certainly true. I can vouch for the doctors and nurses in the hospital in Florida that cared for me when I was recently injured. I've worked hard to give all America's families access to quality health care, and as Governor Chiles and the Secretary have made clear, a critical part of that mission has to be to make sure that our system is free of fraud.

Over the past 4 years, we have made real progress in our efforts to expand access to

health care. Last year we made it possible for people to move from job to job without fear of losing their health insurance. Our balanced budget plan will provide health care coverage for up to 5 million of the 10 million children who don't have it. It preserves and strengthens the Medicare system, ensuring the life of the Medicare Trust Fund for another decade.

Today we are taking the next steps to end the waste, fraud, and abuse in health care that threatens our ability to provide high-quality and affordable health care for America's citizens. Medicare fraud costs us billions of dollars every year. It amounts to a fraud tax that falls on all of our taxpayers but most heavily upon our senior citizens. Because of fraud they have to pay higher premiums and higher out-of-pocket costs that otherwise they would not have to pay.

Medicare and Medicaid are more than just programs, they are the way we do honor to our parents, the way we strengthen our families, the way we care for our poorest and most vulnerable children. We cannot tolerate fraud that robs taxpayers even as it harms those of us to whom we owe a great duty.

The law enforcement partnership described by Governor Chiles and Secretary Shalala has made real strides in the fight against health care fraud. Over the past 4 years, we have assigned more Justice Department prosecutors and more FBI agents to fight health care fraud than ever before. We've won a record number of convictions and settlements in fraud cases. All told, since 1992, the number of health care fraud convictions has increased by 241 percent. Operation Restore Trust, which Secretary Shalala described, has the potential to save \$10 for every dollar invested in it.

All of these efforts together have helped us save over \$20 billion in health care claims. Money that would have been wasted has gone instead to help provide quality health care and peace of mind for America's families.

Today I am pleased to announce that I will send to Congress legislation to continue and toughen our crackdown on fraud and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. First, the best way to prevent fraud is to keep dishonest doctors and other scam artists out

of the Medicare system in the first place. Under this bill, a provider or supplier who's been convicted of fraud or another felony could be barred from joining the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

For example, in Florida, our investigators found a medical equipment supplier previously convicted of securities fraud, and they found that supplier was bilking the Medicare program. He was ordered to pay \$32 million in restitution, and he's back in jail serving a 9-year sentence. But people like this should not be allowed to join Medicare in the first place. With this legislation, it's less likely that they will be able to do that.

Second, our reform would improve safeguards against fraud by requiring anyone who wants to do business with Medicare to register with the Government and give us their Social Security number. This will help track and stop fraudsters who try to repeat their crimes setting up shop under phony names with dummy corporations or in new States.

Third, the legislation will toughen sanctions so that those who cheat pay the price. The Government will have a stronger hand in imposing larger and newer civil monetary fines.

And finally, it will close loopholes in the law that today let Medicare and Medicaid providers pocket overpayments from the Government simply by declaring bankruptcy. Under this bill, Medicare providers will no longer be able to avoid accountability by declaring bankruptcy.

These steps are important. They will save the Government and the American people a great deal of money. They will also buy something that money cannot alone buy, a greater sense of security and peace of mind for our parents, our most vulnerable families, and children. We can and will preserve Medicare. We can and will make the Medicaid system work better and serve more children. The steps we take today will protect and strengthen those systems that mean so much to our families and to our future. And thank you all for your contributions to the effort. Thank you very much. *[Applause]* Thank you.

And let me just say one other thing. This is my first public statement, I think, since coming back from Helsinki. We had a terrific meeting there. It was good for the United

States, good for the people of Russia. And again, I'd like to thank my medical team for making it possible for me to make the trip so soon after my surgery. But it went fine, and it was a remarkable thing, not only the progress we made on NATO but especially on our commitment to slash the nuclear arsenals of both the United States and Russia by 80 percent from their cold war highs, within decades. So I'm very excited about it. It was a good meeting, and I'm glad to be back.

President George Bush's Skydiving

Q. Mr. President, what do you think about your predecessor's venture into skydiving? [Laughter] President Bush is supposed to be parachuting even as we speak. [Laughter]

The President. I am mightily impressed. [Laughter] And I wish him well. I'm excited. I can't wait to see him get down and give us the story. [Laughter]

President's Visit to Mexico

Q. Are you going to have to postpone your Mexico trip because of your injury?

The President. What we have decided to do—and I think we've announced it—we will announce it today—is to postpone the Mexico trip for about a month and put it where I was going to do my full Latin American trip to the other countries, to Central America, to South America, and the Caribbean. And what we're going to do is to make the trip to Mexico, to Costa Rica, and to Barbados, to do Central America and the Caribbean and Mexico during that timeframe. And then later in the year, we're going to go to South America and do that trip, when I'm somewhat more mobile, because, among other things, we're going to Argentina and Brazil. They're big countries. There's going to be a lot of moving around, and I need a little more physical mobility. Besides, I'm hoping to ride horses and do some other things, and I'm not quite ready for that, as you can see.

Medicare Initiative

Q. Mr. President, the cornerstone of the Florida program is the surety bond and the on-site inspections, both of which are missing from your proposal. Why is that?

The President. Do you want to comment on that?

Secretary Donna Shalala. Yes. The on-site inspection is in it. On the surety bond, it's one of the things that we have the authority under our regulatory authority, and we'll have a later announcement on that.

The President. Thank you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:32 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida.

Statement on Campaign Finance Reform Legislation

March 25, 1997

In my State of the Union Address, I challenged Congress to pass bipartisan campaign finance reform by July 4th, the date we celebrate the birth of our democracy. The only way that political reform will become law is if citizens raise their voices to demand change. I strongly support the bipartisan legislation introduced by Senators John McCain and Russ Feingold, and Representatives Chris Shays and Marty Meehan. It is real, it is fair, it is tough, and it will curb the role of big money in our politics.

We know the pressing need for reform. The campaign finance laws are two decades out of date and have been overwhelmed by a flood of money that rises with every election. Above all, campaign finance reform will help us to meet our Nation's fundamental challenges. It will help us balance the budget, fight crime, extend health care to our children, protect our young people from the dangers of tobacco. Reform will help make sure that our political system stands for ordinary Americans and helps them in their daily lives.

At Faneuil Hall, the "Cradle of Liberty," and at Independence Hall, our Founders forged our democracy. Now it is up to all of us, in a new time, to renew that democracy and to make sure that our Government represents the national interest, not just narrow interests. I thank those who are fighting for reform and who are gathered at Faneuil Hall for their leadership and urge all citizens to join in this effort. This year can be the year that we finally pass campaign finance reform.

NOTE: This statement was read at the Project Independence rally for campaign finance reform at Faneuil Hall in Boston, MA.

Proclamation 6979—Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy, 1997

March 25, 1997

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Today, the Greek people and the Hellenic Republic will celebrate the 176th anniversary of the beginning of their struggle for independence.

On this day, it is fitting that we reflect on the enormous contributions the Greek people have made to the modern world. The legacy of the ancient Greeks, in the fields of philosophy, literature, drama, sculpture, and architecture, continues to influence our beliefs, our values, and our concept of art. And, after more than 2,000 years, the ideology of Greece—as embodied in the concept of democracy—is still the ideal that guides us in charting our course for the future.

Greek ideology had a profound effect on our Founding Fathers, who molded the American form of government based upon the principles of Greek democracy. Thomas Jefferson studied the Greek classics in his youth and was inspired by their philosophy throughout his life, most dramatically when he crafted the Declaration of Independence. When formulating his vision for this country, Jefferson specifically referred to the integrated assertions, theories, and aims of the classic Greek world.

Our admiration for Greece continues into the modern day, and we salute its commitment to democracy, to peace, and to a united and stable Europe. We share a partnership with Greece in NATO, and our countries are linked forever by close family relationships between our peoples. Our Nation looks forward to working closely with Greece in the coming years as we examine ways to bring full peace, stability, and prosperity to all the nations of Europe and the world.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim March 25, 1997, as Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy. I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-fifth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-first.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:34 a.m., March 26, 1997]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 27.

**Executive Order 13040—
Amendment to Executive Order
13017, Advisory Commission on
Consumer Protection and Quality in
the Health Care Industry**

March 25, 1997

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to expand membership and ensure broad-based representation for the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry and to revise the deadlines for the Commission's submission to the President of interim and final reports, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Section 1(a) of Executive Order 13017 is amended by deleting the number "20" in the second sentence and inserting the number "32" in lieu thereof.

Sec. 2. Section 3 of Executive Order 13017 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Reports. The Commission shall make a preliminary report to the President by January 31, 1998. A final

report shall be submitted to the President by March 30, 1998."

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 25, 1997.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., March 27, 1997]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 26, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on March 28.

**Remarks Prior to Discussions With
President Alija Izetbegovic of
Bosnia-Herzegovina and an
Exchange With Reporters**

March 26, 1997

President Clinton. Let me say that it's a real pleasure for me to welcome President Izetbegovic back to the White House. I'm looking forward to this meeting and to getting an update on his efforts to complete the implementation of the Dayton accord. The United States remains committed to that and committed to supporting those in Bosnia who are working for that.

And we still have an awful lot of work to do in the time remaining for our mission there on the security front, and then even beyond there will be a lot more to do. So I'm pleased to have him here, and I'm looking forward to our visit.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, why did you send Dennis Ross to the Middle East?

President Clinton. Because I'm concerned about the peace process, and we have been talking among ourselves here intensely over the last several days about whether there are some ideas we ought to advance with the Israelis and the Palestinians, and particularly what we can do to minimize the violence and to get the negotiations back going. So that's what—Dennis' trip is the product of our deliberations here, and we'll see what it produces.

Q. What are you suggesting?

**FBI and Alleged Chinese Efforts To
Influence the 1996 Election**

Q. Mr. President, we never had a chance to ask you yesterday about your response to the possibility that FBI Director Louis Freeh withheld information that you might actually have needed to conduct policy. I was wondering if you have a response to that and what you're doing, if anything, to look into whether that actually occurred.

President Clinton. Well, first of all, obviously I have no way of knowing—you don't know what you don't get. But if you look at the last several years, or just the last couple of years, we have worked with the FBI in areas that have both national security implications and the question of a crime that violates the criminal laws of the United States. The two most obvious and most recent cases are the Khobar Towers and the Atlanta bombing during the Olympics. And we worked with them on both cases.

Now, they have dual obligations to share with the White House and with the State Department—the Secretary of State—where appropriate, information we need to protect and advance national security and to preserve the integrity of criminal investigations. And ultimately, those things almost have to be resolved on a case-by-case basis, where there is a doubt, by the Attorney General.

And I'm confident that that is what has been and will continue to be done in this case. And that's really the best answer I can give you here.

Q. Do you still have strong confidence in Louis Freeh to run the FBI?

President Clinton. Yes, I have no basis—on the basis of this incident, I don't have any information at this time which would call into question that confidence. These are not always easy questions. And that's why the Attorney General has to resolve them when there is a real doubt. I just wanted—I wanted to make sure that the national security interests of the country have been fully taken into account and that there's really been an honest effort to look at all the evidence and to resolve it.

I can't say that—to go back to your original question, since I don't know what was not given, I can't make a judgment about it.

Q. Well, why—

President Clinton. But I do know that the Attorney General was sensitive to it, and I believe will continue to make an effort to resolve the matters in the appropriate way.

Q. But there seems to be a—Mr. President, there seems to be a disconnect with what you get. I mean, it seems to me that they are not telling you a lot of things that you should know.

President Clinton. Well, I'm concerned about that, as I said, but the only way we have of resolving that is through the Attorney General. And again, I've seen these suggestions in the press, but I don't know what the facts are. I think everyone understands that there are significant national security issues at stake here and that the White House, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of State, as well as the President, need to know when the national security issues are brought into play.

And I have no reason—I have no evidence on which I could say that, that we have not been able to get the information we need. I know what I read in the press story and I know that we have raised it with the Attorney General and I believe that she will do the best she can to make the right decision.

Vice President's Visit to China

Q. Mr. President, have you talked to Vice President Gore since he's been in China, sir?

President Clinton. I haven't talked to him because of—I think he hasn't wanted to bother me because of my knee and the time differences, but I've gotten daily reports at least once and sometimes more than once a day on the Vice President's trip. And so far, I'm quite pleased with what I hear and what I have seen.

And I've obviously gotten my daily reports and sometimes more on the First Lady's trip. And I'm quite pleased by what I have seen there as well.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Would you consider another emergency summit with the Mideast leaders?

President Clinton. I don't want to comment anymore about anything I would consider on the Middle East until I hear back from Mr. Ross. He has very explicit instructions that he is implementing as a result of

our meeting on this. And I want to see what happens as a result of that.

But I'm concerned about it. I think everybody in the world who's worked for peace in the Middle East is concerned about it. We're all going to put our heads together and do the best we can.

One more Bosnia question, yes.

Bosnian Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, the peace process seems to be in trouble in Bosnia. Could you comment on that?

President Clinton. Well, I'm going to talk to the President about what we can do to push it along. It's obviously going to take an effort on behalf of all parties. But the things that we knew from the beginning would be difficult, have been difficult. The resettlement issues, the return issues have been difficult.

But I think it's important not to lose sight of what has been done and not to lose sight of the fact that there will be an international security presence there for quite some time yet, during which time we have to work hard to do as much as we possibly can to implement the Dayton agreement. And that's going to be my commitment and what I look forward to discussing with President Izetbegovic.

Q. But you fully still expect U.S. troops to be out by June '98 as scheduled?

President Clinton. I do. I think that in the—I think we all understood that we couldn't have an international security presence in a country forever. But on the other hand, I think we have to—we shouldn't focus so much on that now, as I have pleaded with everyone. We should focus on what's going to happen tomorrow and next week and next month and between now and the end of this year and in the months in 1998 that we have. We have—there is a lot of very specific work to be done that, if done and done right, will make it possible for the nation to succeed and for the people to be brought back into a more constructive cooperation and existence when we're gone.

Q. How does the President of Bosnia—do you feel that way too? Do you feel hopeful?

President Izetbegovic. Yes, I hope. First, I have to thank Mr. President for receiving me twice because of his leg.

And we have some problems with the process of the Dayton—implementation of Dayton, especially civil part of it is going slowly. And the implementation operation also is going slowly. We know that it is—that is—all that is our job firstly, primarily our job, but we need help of the States to push on the—and I am going to talk about this problem with Mr. President.

Q. Do you think your country will be ready in a year and a half to exist on its own?

President Izetbegovic. I believe yes on condition—maybe on four conditions: If civil part of the Dayton agreement would be implemented, first; secondly, equip and train program also would be implemented; then, if—protocol about disarmament would be done; and an additional condition, maybe if Bosnia would be received in the partnership of peace. That's—on these four conditions, I believe that SFOR forces or foreign forces can leave Bosnia without big problems.

President Clinton. Thank you all.

President Izetbegovic. Some problems, maybe, but—

President Clinton. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:29 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, President Clinton referred to Ambassador Dennis Ross, Special Middle East Coordinator. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry

March 26, 1997

Thank you very much. Thank you, Secretary Shalala, Acting Secretary Metzler. Thank you both for the work you've done on this. I thank the Commission members for their willingness to serve, those who are here and a few who could not be here with us today. And I thank all of you here in this audience for your interest in this profoundly important matter.

The Advisory Commission that I announced today will help to chart our way through a time of profound change in health care. Their task will be focused and urgent: to find ways to ensure quality and to ensure that the rights of consumers in health care are protected.

Since I took office, we have been committed to improving our health care system, to making it more affordable, more accessible, while preserving its high quality. You have heard Secretary Shalala mention some of the things we have done together. We've worked with States to expand Medicaid to more than 2 million Americans who previously had no insurance. We reached across party lines to enact the Kassebaum-Kennedy law that provides that working families will not lose their insurance when they change jobs, increased the health care tax deduction for 3 million self-employed Americans. And now in our budget plan, we have funds sufficiently targeted to extend coverage to as many as half of our 10 million American children who still don't have medical coverage.

We've worked to constrain costs. Just yesterday, I announced a new effort to combat the multibillion dollar problem of fraud and abuse in Medicare and Medicaid. Our balanced budget proposal also strengthens Medicare through savings and overdue structural reforms.

Of course, we're not alone in this. The private sector has found ways to rein in costs, sometimes dramatically. And in many cases, changes in the health care delivery system have, frankly, also improved its quality. For example, the growing recognition of the value of preventive care, such as mammography screening, is saving and extending lives and the quality of life. This is all very encouraging. Step by step we have been working to expand access to health care, and today we take the next step.

In this time of transition, many Americans worry that lower costs mean lower quality and less attention to their rights. On balance, however, managed health care plans, HMO's, PPO's, and others, give patients good care and greater choice at lower cost. Still, we must make sure that these changes do not keep health professionals from offering the best and the most medically appro-

priate services to their patients. Managed care managed well can be the best deal for our families. Whether they have traditional health care or managed care, none of our people should ever have inferior care.

I am proud that the Medicare and Medicaid programs have taken the lead in responding to the quality concerns of both patients and health care providers, as Secretary Shalala has just described. But we're learning the defining, measuring, and enforcing quality is far from a simple task. There are many complicated issues. They require thoughtful study. And not surprisingly, there are many areas where broad-based consensus on how best to proceed does not yet exist.

That is why I decided late last year to establish the Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the health care industry. Today I am happy to introduce the members of that Commission to the American people. They are a highly distinguished, broad-based, and diverse group. They represent consumers, business, labor, health care providers, insurers, managed care plans, State and local governments, health care quality experts. Their specialties are wide-ranging, including care for children, the elderly, women, people with disabilities, mental illness, or AIDS. This Commission includes some of the best health care policy minds in our Nation and a lot of people with hands-on experience. Its task will be as challenging as it is critical.

Today, to assure that they get busy right away, I am charging the Commission to develop a consumer bill of rights so that health care patients get the information and care they need when they need it. Let's assure that patients and their families: first, that the health care professionals who are treating them are free to provide the best medical advice available; second, that their providers are not subject to inappropriate financial incentives to limit care; third, that our sickest and most vulnerable patients, frequently the elderly and people with disabilities, are receiving the best medical care for their unique needs; fourth, that consumers have access to simple and fair procedures for resolving health care coverage disputes with plans; fifth, and perhaps most important, that consumers have basic information about their

rights and responsibilities, about the plans—the benefits the plans offer, about how to access the health care they need, and about the quality of their providers and their health care plans.

I'm delighted that the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor will take on the task of being the Commission's cochairs. I look forward to reviewing their first report at the end of the year and their final report next March.

The need for this Commission is real. It is urgent. It will give us a roadmap to help us make our way through the time of rapid change we now see in our health care system. There are few people in the Nation better suited to the task than the members of this Commission. And again, let me say, I want to thank them for their commitment to serve. And to all the rest of you, let me say one of the things—one of the many things I have learned in the last 4 years as President, is that a distinguished commission, broadly based with a clear mandate, can make a profound positive difference for our country.

In the health care related areas, I ask you to think of only two. Think of the work done by the Gulf War Commission and what we now know that we did not know when they started to meet and work. Think of the remarkable work done by the Commission that dealt with those who were exposed to human radiation experiments just a few decades ago here and the work that they have done.

There is a peculiar way in which the citizens of the United States, when brought together around a clear mandate interfacing with their Government and with the private sector, can do more than either the Government or the private sector could do alone.

And so again, let me say, I'm very hopeful about this Commission. I look forward to their progress on the consumer's bill of rights. I look forward to all the work that they do. And I ask you to join me in thanking them for their willingness to serve.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:32 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Cynthia Metzler, Acting Secretary of Labor.

Remarks on the National Cancer Institute's Recommendations on Mammography and an Exchange With Reporters

March 27, 1997

The President. Secretary Shalala has just briefed me on the National Cancer Institute's new recommendations on mammography. These recommendations, based on the latest and best medical evidence, give clear, consistent guidance to women in our national fight against breast cancer. Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women. It affects one in eight women in their lifetimes, and has touched the families of nearly every American, including my own.

We may not yet have a cure for breast cancer, but we do know that early detection and early treatment are our most potent weapons against this dread disease and we know that mammography can save lives. That is why it's important to send a clear, consistent message to women and to their families about when to start getting mammograms and how often to repeat them.

After careful study of the science, the National Cancer Advisory Board has now concluded that women between the ages of 40 and 49 should get a mammography examination for breast cancer every 1 or 2 years, in consultation with their doctors. The National Cancer Institute has now accepted these recommendations. Now women in their forties will have clear guidance based on the best science, and action to match it.

Today I am taking action to bring Medicare, Medicaid, and the Federal employee health plans in line with the National Cancer Institute's recommendations. First, in the Medicare budget I am sending to Congress today I am making annual screening mammography exams, beginning at age 40, a covered expense without co-insurance or deductibles. Second, Secretary Shalala is sending a letter to State Medicaid directors urging them to also cover annual mammograms beginning at 40 and assuring them that the Federal Government will pay its matching share if they do so. And today I am directing the Office of Personnel Management to require all Federal health benefit plans to comply with the National Cancer Advisory

Board's recommendations on mammogram screenings, beginning next year.

The Federal Government is doing its part to make sure women have both coverage and access to this potentially lifesaving test. I want to challenge private health insurance plans to do the same. They, too, should cover regular screening mammograms for women 40 and over.

Finally, we know there has been much discussion on this issue and a lot of confusion. That is why we are launching a major public education campaign to make sure every woman and every health care professional in America, that all of them are aware of these new recommendations. This is a major step forward in our fight against breast cancer.

In addition to Secretary Shalala, I want to thank National Cancer Advisory Board Chairperson, Dr. Barbara Rimer, and all the members of the Board, along with the NCI Director, Dr. Richard Klausner, for the fine job that they did in producing these recommendations.

I also want to thank the First Lady, who could not be with us here because of her visit to Africa. She has devoted countless hours to educating women about the importance of mammography, and this is a happy day for her. She has especially tried to educate older women to take advantage of the Medicare coverage of mammograms, because we know that too few of them still do. And that's the last point I would like to make. These guidelines and this coverage, it's all very good, but unless women are willing to actually take advantage of the coverage, we won't have the full benefit of the recommendations and the findings that have been made.

Now I'd like to turn the microphone over to Secretary Shalala to make a few comments.

[At this point, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala made brief remarks.]

Heaven's Gate Mass Suicide

Q. Mr. President, do you have any comment on the mass suicide in California?

The President. Well, of course, all I know is what I read about it this morning and what I saw last night reported. But it's heart-

breaking; it's sickening; it's shocking. I think it's important that we get as many facts as we can about this and try to determine what, in fact, motivated those people and what all of us can do to make sure that there aren't other people thinking in that same way out there in our country, that aren't so isolated that they can create a world for themselves that may justify that kind of thing. It's very troubling to me. But I don't think I know enough to make a definitive comment about it.

Democratic Party Finances

Q. Mr. President, switching gears on another subject, the Democratic Party emerged from this most recent election in the aftermath of all of these fundraising problems—it seems to be in pretty bad shape financially—enormous debt that they can't repay. What, if anything, can you do about this, and how much responsibility do you have to try to get the Democratic Party back into shape?

The President. Oh, a lot, and I have been doing a lot, and I will do more. We knew that we would have to spend—last year when it became obvious that our congressional candidates were going to be outspent, massively, we did everything we could to raise a good deal of money at the end. But the committees and the Democratic Committee went into debt with money that they could legally borrow in the hope of trying to be competitive. They actually did a pretty good job. They were still outspent, I figure, in the last 10 days, 2 weeks, probably 4 or 5 to 1 in all of the contested races. But we knew that would happen, and we knew it would take some time to pay it back. But I'm not particularly concerned about it. I think we will pay it back. And it was, I thought, important.

Keep in mind, we were at the bottom of the barrel in November of '94, and in 1995, we did a good job, I think, of building our party back and showing what the clear differences were between the two parties. And the previous leadership of the party deserves a lot of credit. We got up to a million small donors, and they're coming back now. They're beginning to make their contributions, and that's very encouraging. So I think we'll get there. I'm not particularly concerned about it.

We made a deliberate decision to kind of downplay the Inaugural and not to try to tie too much of that to fundraising, so we're going to have to work harder this year. But I've been doing some work, as you know, and I will continue to do more.

Q. Do you think Governor Romer has second thoughts about some of the changes that previously eliminating contributions from subsidiaries of foreign companies and also non-U.S. citizens? He seems to be having some second thoughts about some of those proposals you made over the past few months.

The President. Well, let me say, I still don't believe—I think, on balance, it's better policy to say that people who can't vote shouldn't contribute. In terms of the subsidiaries, the real problem there is the law says if the money is made in the United States, it can be given in the United States. The problem is, how do you ever know that? And so I think that he was trying to bend over backwards to get us off on the right foot.

But I'd be willing to talk to him about it. But the main thing is we're just going to have to get together and work hard and rally our troops and remind them of what we're trying to do here, how we're trying to balance the budget, what we're trying to do for education, what we're trying to do to move the country forward and get the efforts going. We've had several successful events this year. We just have to do more. And we knew—what you have to do after an election, when we saw all this third party money and all these other things coming down the pike, we wanted to give our Members of Congress a chance to be competitive, and so we undertook to do so. And I'm glad we did, but we're just going to have to work double hard now to pay the money back, and we'll do that. We'll pay our debts, and we'll make our budget this year.

Ambassador Ross and Vice President Gore

Q. Have you received any updates from Ambassador Ross or the Vice President?

The President. Yes.

Q. And what have they been?

The President. Well, Ambassador Ross had a very good meeting with Chairman

Arafat, and he's proceeding now on his trip. And I don't have anything else to tell you, but he was encouraged by the response of Chairman Arafat to the matters that we discussed here before he left.

I started the day this morning with physical therapy and a talk with the Vice President in China, which was also good therapy. [Laughter] And he said to me that in every aspect, his trip had gone quite well and better than he had anticipated, and he was anxious to get back and give me a report on all the issues that we're concerned about. But I think the trip has been a real validation for our strategy of engagement with China, of taking our agreements, our disagreements, our matters of common interest, our matters of concern directly to them. And he is very pleased with the results so far, and I certainly am very pleased with the work he's done, with the speech he gave on human rights and with all the work that he's done in China so far. I'm encouraged about it. I think the trip has been well worth making.

FBI and Alleged Chinese Efforts To Influence the 1996 Election

Q. Have you seen that Janet Reno gave Louis Freeh a ringing endorsement this morning—every confidence in his leadership at the FBI?

The President. Well, as I said—of course, she works with him every day, and that's why I said yesterday what I did. I was troubled by the headline in the New York Times story, but I did not know the facts. And I think it's important for me not to assume that someone has done or failed to do something that's adverse to the national interest before I know it's true. And she's the one that has to make those calls. And as she said in her comments, the system that we have—the President appoints the Director of the FBI, but the FBI is a part of the Justice Department. It's a part of the justice system. And whenever you have dual responsibilities in the Government, you're going to have some time when you've got to make a close call.

And I still don't know—as I said, I just literally don't know—I could actually tell you whether I agreed or disagreed, if I knew what—if and what information had not been forthcoming to the National Security Coun-

cil. I do believe that there should be a—that doubt should be resolved in favor of disclosure to the National Security Council of essential national security information. But the Attorney General has to resolve those things. And I trust her to do it. And so, what she said is fine by me.

Q. Is there a problem if the President of the United States—a lot of Americans simply don't understand—the President of the United States says, "I don't know that there's a problem because I haven't necessarily been given"—

The President. Well, I think there is. Yes, I think there is. If I knew that one existed, I would agree that there was a problem. But I don't know it. And I'm still not sure that there was. I just have to—I have to trust the Attorney General to make sure that the National Security Council gets the information that we need to make good national security judgments here. I think, for example, in the Khobar Towers incident, there is absolutely not a shred of evidence that there's anything that we have been denied. And so, if I knew that there was and I knew what it was and I thought there was a mistake, I'd be happy to say that there's an honest disagreement here, but I just don't know that there is one.

Ambassadorial Nominations

Q. Has your administration been hamstrung in terms of ambassadorial appointments, appointments at the State Department and so forth because of all of these investigations on the campaign?

The President. No, not at all. As a matter of fact, we've been working on getting ready for the next round of ambassadorial appointments. I approved a small number of them, oh, probably a couple of weeks ago so we could move in critical countries. But the others we're trying to do on a schedule which at least guarantees that all the Ambassadors now serving will do the traditional 3-year tour of duty. So we have some time on them. But we've worked very hard for the last month or so on that, and I don't see those two things as in conflict or a problem at all.

Thank you.

President's Health

Q. How do you feel today?

The President. I feel fine. Every day I'm getting a little more mobile, and I'm getting able to, you know, do a little more. I'll tell you one thing, I wouldn't wish this on anyone. But it's been a very enlightening experience, a very humbling experience. And the respect that I feel now for people who spend all day every day in a wheelchair or people who spend all day every day in braces and on crutches is enormous.

The dignity and the strength of character that it takes to kind of organize your life and carry it out if you're always subject to some sort of significant physical disability is enormous. These are things that we all sometimes see, but when you've felt just a little taste of it, when you realize what it means to be able to just navigate and do the basic things in life—just to dress yourself for the first time when you couldn't do it, for example—it just makes you understand that the rest of us in society who have been fortunate enough to have full use of our physical facilities owe an enormous amount of respect and sensitivity to people who don't.

It's just been a stunning experience for me. I mean, I will never again see a person who has to deal with a disability in the same light again. I mean, it's just—it's had a profound impact. It's nothing I didn't know before, but feeling it and knowing it are two different things.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

Q. Like your doctor after you all the time?

The President. Yes. She just wants to make sure I don't blow it.

Q. I see her—we see her right here.

The President. There she is.

Q. She's watching.

The President. These crutches are quite good. This way you can walk by putting your bad leg down and keeping the weight here. Otherwise, you have to just do this and then kind of do that. But if you can walk, it's a lot easier; the chances of falling are less.

Q. They're better than the traditional crutches.

The President. Yes, much better.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:17 p.m., in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado, general chair, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks Honoring the NCAA Football Champion University of Florida Gators

March 27, 1997

The President. Thank you very much. Please be seated. President and Mrs. Lombardi, Athletic Director Foley, Mayor Jennings, Congresswoman Thurman—I know what a happy day this is for you. Senator Breaux, we're glad to see you here. Senator Breaux thinks he represents anyplace that's perpetually warm. [Laughter] We're honored to have you here.

Let me say, when Coach Spurrier and Danny and I walked in I was hoping, when I hobbled in, that one of you might mistake me for a member of the team who just had a rough time in the bowl game. [Laughter] But I remembered that a few years ago, Danny had a little knee injury, and if I come back from mine as well as he did from his, my future is secure, I think.

I am delighted to be here with you. I look forward to these occasions every year, but I especially want to congratulate you on a wonderful season and an astonishing championship game. The 32-point margin of victory, I'm sure all of you know, against the number one ranked team is the largest in bowl history and something that the University of Florida can always be very proud of.

I'd also note—it's somewhat difficult for me to note this, being from Arkansas, but every year I've been President, Florida has won the Southeastern Conference championship. [Laughter] I was impressed not only by the stars on the team—by Danny Wuerffel and Ike Hilliard, and by the fact that Terry Jackson joined his brother, Willy, in Sugar Bowl history by rushing for over 100 yards—I was impressed by the teamwork of this team.

And I have followed college football very closely for nearly 40 years now, and I really believe that the University of Florida, in the last 5 or 6 years, has written a whole new chapter in college football in much the way that Oklahoma did a few decades ago with the wishbone. You have changed football forever and for the better. It is more exciting than it has ever been before, and you do it better than anyone else.

I know that this national championship was a special triumph for Steve Spurrier because when he played for the Gators, he won the Heisman Trophy. He came back as a coach to have many successes, but there is no success like winning the national championship and doing it for your alma mater after so many efforts and so many fine performances and, frankly, when it doesn't come so easily, when you have to keep fighting for it, even sometimes when you think it's not quite fair, must make it all the sweeter.

I've also been in a position of having to try to defeat someone who once beat me for something I cared a great deal about, and that makes it a little better, too. *[Laughter]* So again, let me say it's a great honor to have you in the White House. I know I'm too old to play for this team, but don't hold my injury against me.

Coach Spurrier, the floor is yours.

Thank you.

[At this point, head coach Steve Spurrier and quarterback Danny Wuerffel made brief remarks and presented the President with a jersey.]

Coach Spurrier. I don't know if you can wear that jogging or not.

The President. Yes, I can. Thank you. Move that out of here so we can take a good picture of this.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:55 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to John V. Lombardi, president, University of Florida, and his wife, Cathryn; Jeremy Foley, Athletic Director, University of Florida; and Mayor Edward Jennings of Gainesville, FL.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Reporting on the Situation in Zaire March 27, 1997

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

The Republic of Zaire has been embroiled in an internal conflict for several months. Rebels seeking to oust ailing President Mobutu Sese Seko have captured more than one-fifth of the country. While there is no evidence that Americans are being directly targeted, the potential for civil disorder and

general unrest in Kinshasa may subject American citizens and property to a range of risks, including those from criminal acts and random violence.

On March 25, 1997, a standby evacuation force of U.S. military personnel from the U.S. European Command and the United States deployed to Congo and Gabon to provide enhanced security for the more than 300 American private citizens, government employees, and selected third country nationals in Kinshasa, should their evacuation become necessary. We do not anticipate that the more than 200 remaining American citizens outside Kinshasa will be at risk. These forces augment the noncombat-equipped enabling forces that deployed to Congo on March 21, 1997, to prepare for a possible evacuation operation.

The enabling and evacuation forces based in Brazzaville, Congo and Libreville, Gabon are prepared for a possible evacuation. These forces include a forward deployed Joint Task Force Headquarters, fixed-wing and rotary aircraft, airport control and support equipment, and medical and security personnel and equipment. In addition, USS *Nassau*, with a Marine Battalion Landing Team and a helicopter squadron reinforced with fixed-wing AV-8 Harrier aircraft embarked, is moving into the area.

Although U.S. forces are equipped for combat, this movement is being undertaken solely for the purpose of preparing to protect American citizens and property. United States forces will redeploy as soon as it is determined that an evacuation is not necessary or, if necessary, is completed.

I have taken this action pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

I am providing this report as part of my efforts to keep the Congress fully informed, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action to prepare to protect American citizens in Zaire.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives,

and Strom Thurmond, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Memorandum on Protections for Human Subjects of Classified Research

March 27, 1997

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Chair of the Consumer Product Safety Commission

Subject: Strengthened Protections for Human Subjects of Classified Research

I have worked hard to restore trust and ensure openness in government. This memorandum will further our progress toward these goals by strengthening the Federal Government's protections for human subjects of classified research.

In January 1994, I established the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments (the "Advisory Committee") to examine reports that the government had funded and conducted unethical human radiation experiments during the Cold War. I directed the Advisory Committee to uncover the truth, recommend steps to right past wrongs, and propose ways to prevent unethical human subjects research from occurring in the future. In its October 1995 final report, the Advisory Committee recommended, among other things, that the government modify its policy governing classified research on human subjects ("Recommendations for Balancing National Security Inter-

ests and the Rights of the Public," Recommendation 15, Final Report, Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments). This memorandum sets forth policy changes in response to those recommendations.

The Advisory Committee acknowledged that it is in the Nation's interest to continue to allow the government to conduct classified research involving human subjects where such research serves important national security interests. The Advisory Committee found, however, that classified human subjects research should be a "rare event" and that the "subjects of such research, as well as the interests of the public in openness in science and in government, deserve special protections." The Advisory Committee was concerned about "exceptions to informed consent requirements and the absence of any special review and approval process for human research that is to be classified." The Advisory Committee recommended that in all classified research projects the agency conducting or sponsoring the research meet the following requirements:

- obtain informed consent from all human subjects;
- inform subjects of the identity of the sponsoring agency;
- inform subjects that the project involves classified research;
- obtain approval by an "independent panel of nongovernmental experts and citizen representatives, all with the necessary security clearances" that reviews scientific merit, risk-benefit tradeoffs, and ensures subjects have enough information to make informed decisions to give valid consent; and
- maintain permanent records of the panel's deliberations and consent procedures.

This memorandum implements these recommendations with some modifications. For classified research, it prohibits waiver of informed consent and requires researchers to disclose that the project is classified. For all but minimal risk studies, it requires researchers to inform subjects of the sponsoring agency. It also requires permanent record-keeping.

The memorandum also responds to the Advisory Committee's call for a special review process for classified human subjects research. It requires that institutional review boards for secret projects include a non-governmental member, and establishes an appeals process so that any member of a review board who believes a project should not go forward can appeal the boards' decision to approve it.

Finally, this memorandum sets forth additional steps to ensure that classified human research is rare. It requires the heads of Federal agencies to disclose annually the number of secret human research projects undertaken by their agency. It also prohibits any agency from conducting secret human research without first promulgating a final rule applying the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, as modified in this memorandum, to the agency.

These steps, set forth in detail below, will preserve the government's ability to conduct any necessary classified research involving human subjects while ensuring adequate protection of research participants.

1. *Modifications to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects as it Affects Classified Research.* All agencies that may conduct or support classified research that is subject to the 1991 Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects ("Common Rule") (56 Fed. Reg. 28010-28018) shall promptly jointly publish in the *Federal Register* the following proposed revisions to the Common Rule as it affects classified research. The Office for Protection from Research Risks in the Department of Health and Human Services shall be the lead agency and, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget, shall coordinate the joint rulemaking.

(a) The agencies shall jointly propose to prohibit waiver of informed consent for classified research.

(b) The agencies shall jointly propose to prohibit the use of expedited review procedures under the Common Rule for classified research.

(c) The joint proposal should request comment on whether all research exemptions under the Common Rule should be maintained for classified research.

(d) The agencies shall jointly propose to require that in classified research involving human subjects, two additional elements of information be provided to potential subjects when consent is sought from subjects:

(i) the identity of the sponsoring Federal agency. Exceptions are allowed if the head of the sponsoring agency determines that providing this information could compromise intelligence sources or methods and that the research involves no more than minimal risk to subjects. The determination about sources and methods is to be made in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. The determination about risk is to be made in consultation with the Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(ii) a statement that the project is "classified" and an explanation of what classified means.

(e) The agencies shall jointly propose to modify the institutional review board ("IRB") approval process for classified human subjects research as follows:

(i) The Common Rule currently requires that each IRB "include at least one member who is not otherwise affiliated with the institution and who is not part of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the institution." For classified research, the agencies shall define "not otherwise affiliated with the institution," as a nongovernmental member with the appropriate security clearance.

(ii) Under the Common Rule, research projects are approved by the IRB if a "majority of those (IRB) members present at a meeting" approved the project. For classified research, the agencies shall propose to permit any member of the IRB who does not believe a specific project should be approved by the IRB to appeal a majority decision to approve the project to the head of the sponsoring agency. If the agency head affirms the IRB's decision to approve the project, the dis-

senting IRB member may appeal the IRB's decisions to the Director of OSTP. The Director of OSTP shall review the IRB's decision and approve or disapprove the project, or, at the Director's discretion, convene an IRB made up of nongovernmental officials, each with the appropriate security clearances, to approve or disapprove the project.

- (iii) IRBs for classified research shall determine whether potential subjects need access to classified information to make a valid informed consent decision.

2. *Final Rules.* Agencies shall, within 1 year, after considering any comments, promulgate final rules on the protection of human subjects of classified research.

3. *Agency Head Approval of Classified Research Projects.* Agencies may not conduct any classified human research project subject to the Common Rule unless the agency head has personally approved the specific project.

4. *Annual Public Disclosure of the Number of Classified Research Projects.* Each agency head shall inform the Director of OSTP by September 30 of each year of the number of classified research projects involving human subjects underway on that date, the number completed in the previous 12-month period, and the number of human subjects in each project. The Director of OSTP shall report the total number of classified research projects and participating subjects to the President and shall then report to the congressional armed services and intelligence committees and further shall publish the numbers in the *Federal Register*.

5. *Definitions.* For purposes of this memorandum, the terms "research" and "human subject" shall have the meaning set forth in the Common Rule. "Classified human research" means research involving "classified information" as defined in Executive Order 12958.

6. *No Classified Human Research Without Common Rule.* Beginning one year after the date of this memorandum, no agency shall conduct or support classified human research without having proposed and promulgated the Common Rule, including the changes set

forth in this memorandum and any subsequent amendments.

7. *Judicial Review.* This memorandum is not intended to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any other persons.

8. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 28.

Statement on Protections for Human Subjects of Classified Research

March 28, 1997

When I accepted the Advisory Committee's report in October of 1995, I promised that it would not be left on the shelf to gather dust. I made a commitment that we would learn from the lessons the committee's report offered and use it as a roadmap to lead us to better choices in the future. We have actively worked to respond to the Advisory Committee's recommendations to make the record of these experiments open to the public, to improve ethics in human research today, and to right the wrongs of the past.

The report we are releasing today is an important milestone in our progress, but we are by no means at the end of our journey. Much work remains to be done. I am confident that all of us—the eminent committee that produced the original report, the Federal officials who worked so hard to support the committee's efforts, and most importantly, the citizens of this great country from whose experiences we have learned so much—can together help ensure a better world for our children.

NOTE: Secretary of Energy Federico Peña read the President's statement in a briefing announcing the report entitled, "Building Public Trust: Actions To Respond to the Report of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments."

Message on the Observance of Easter, 1997

March 28, 1997

Warm greetings to everyone celebrating Easter.

For almost two millennia, Christians around the world have celebrated this sacred and joyous season as a time of promises fulfilled. It is the promise that a long, harsh winter will dissolve into the warmth and beauty of spring. It is the promise that hearts can be changed and lives renewed by God's love and forgiveness. It is the promise that the sufferings of Good Friday will be transformed into the glorious triumph of Easter morning.

Now, as we swiftly approach the dawn of a new millennium, let us strive together to fulfill our own promise, both as individuals and as a nation. By strengthening our families and communities, bringing hope and help to those in need, and creating a climate of peace and reconciliation where hatred and violence and prejudice have no place, we can each play a vital role in carrying out God's loving plan for humanity. As Saint John's Gospel so eloquently reminds us, ". . . God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved."

As you gather with family and friends to share the joys of this holy season, Hillary and I extend best wishes to all for a wonderful Easter.

Bill Clinton

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Cuba

March 28, 1997

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

This report is submitted pursuant to 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6) (the "CDA"), as amended by section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, Public law 104-114 (March 12, 1996), 110 Stat. 785, 22 U.S.C. 6021-91 (the "LIBERTAD Act"), which requires that I report to the Congress on a semiannual basis detailing payments

made to Cuba by any United States person as a result of the provision of telecommunications services authorized by this subsection.

The CDA, which provides that telecommunications services are permitted between the United States and Cuba, specifically authorizes the President to provide for the issuance of licenses for payments due to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services. The CDA states that licenses may provide for full or partial settlement of telecommunications services with Cuba, but does not require any withdrawal from a blocked account. Following enactment of the CDA on October 23, 1992, a number of U.S. telecommunications companies successfully negotiated agreements to provide telecommunications services between the United States and Cuba consistent with policy guidelines developed by the Department of State and the Federal Communications Commission.

Subsequent to enactment of the CDA, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) amended the Cuban Assets Control Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 515 (the "CACR"), to provide for specific licensing on a case-by-case basis for certain transactions incident to the receipt or transmission of telecommunications between the United States and Cuba, 31 C.F.R. 515.542(c), including settlement of charges under traffic agreements.

The OFAC has issued eight licenses authorizing transactions incident to the receipt or transmission of telecommunications between the United States and Cuba since the enactment of the CDA. None of these licenses permits payments to the Government of Cuba from a blocked account. For the period June 30, 1996, through December 31, 1996, OFAC-licensed U.S. carriers reported payments to the Government of Cuba in settlement of charges under telecommunications traffic agreements as follows:

AT&T Corporation (formerly, American Telephone and Telegraph Company)	\$19,162,032
AT&T de Puerto Rico	227,709
Global One (formerly Sprint Incorporated)	2,589,706

IDB WorldCom Services, Inc. (formerly, IDB Communications, Inc.)	561,553
MCI International, Inc. (formerly, MCI Communications Corporation)	5,354,423
Telefonica Larga Distancia de Puerto Rico, Inc.	104,498
WilTel, Inc. (formerly, WilTel Underseas Cable, Inc.)	2,913,610
WorldCom, Inc. (formerly, LDDS Communications, Inc.)	1,687,896
Total	32,601,427

I shall continue to report semiannually on telecommunications payments to the Government of Cuba from United States persons.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

March 24

The White House announced that the President will meet with King Hussein I of Jordan at the White House on April 1.

March 25

The White House announced that the President's scheduled visits to Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela have been postponed to facilitate his recovery from knee surgery. The President will visit Mexico May 6-7, and Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela October 12-17.

The White House announced that the President will open his national service conference, the Summit for America's Future, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, PA, April 28. On the way, the President will stop

in Germantown, PA, to participate in a clean-up day with AmeriCorps volunteers April 27.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released March 24

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by NSC Senior Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control Robert Bell on the anti-ballistic missile and theater missile defenses agreement at the Helsinki summit

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of King Hussein I of Jordan

Released March 25

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala on the Medicare fraud initiative

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing Ambassador Dennis Ross' visit to the Middle East

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing postponement of Presidential travel to Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela

Released March 26

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Response to questions taken at Press Secretary Mike McCurry's briefing

Released March 27

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Released March 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Energy Secretary Federico Peña, Assistant Energy Sec-

retary Tara O'Toole, and Acting Associate Attorney General John Dwyer on human radiation experiments

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved March 25

H.R. 514 / Public Law 105-7
District of Columbia Inspector General Improvement Act of 1997

**United States
Government
Printing Office**

SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS
Washington, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, \$300

BULK RATE
Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Government Printing Office
PERMIT G-26